arXiv:0801.1948v3 [math.NT] 6 Oct 2008

ON THE CONNECTED COMPONENTS OF MODULI SPACES OF FINITE FLAT MODELS

NAOKI IMAI

Abstract. We prove that the non-ordinary component is connected in the moduli spaces of finite flat models of two-dimensional local Galois representations over finite fields. This was conjectured by Kisin. As an application to global Galois representations, we prove a theorem on the modularity comparing a deformation ring and a Hecke ring.

Introduction

Let K be a p-adic field for $p > 2$, and let $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ be a two-dimensional continuous representation of the absolute Galois group G_K over a finite field $\mathbb{F}$ of characteristic p. The projective scheme $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ over $\mathbb{F}$ is the moduli of finite flat models of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ with some determinant condition. From the viewpoint of the application to the modularity problem, we are interested in the connected components of $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$. The ordinary component of $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ was determined in [Kis], and Kisin conjectured that the non-ordinary component is connected. We prove this conjecture, and the main theorem is the following.

Theorem. *Let $\mathbb{F}'$ be a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}$. Suppose $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ correspond to objects $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}'}, \mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}'}$ of $(\mathrm{Mod}/\mathfrak{S})_{\mathbb{F}'}$ respectively. If $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}'}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}'}$ are both non-ordinary, then x_1 and x_2 lie on the same connected component of $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$.*

When K is totally ramified over $\mathbb{Q}_p$, this was proved in [Kis]. If the residue field of K is bigger than $\mathbb{F}_p$, the situation changes greatly because $\mathfrak{S} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}$ can be split into a direct product. When K is a general p-adic field, the case of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ being the trivial representation was treated in [Gee].

As an application to global Galois representations, we prove a theorem on the modularity, which states that a deformation ring is isomorphic to a Hecke ring up to p-power torsion kernel. This completes Kisin's theory for GL_2.

Acknowledgment. The author is grateful to his advisor Takeshi Saito for his careful reading of an earlier version of this paper and for his helpful comments. He would like to thank the referee for a careful reading of this paper and a number of suggestions for improvements.

Notation. Throughout this paper, we use the following notation. Let $p > 2$ be a prime number, and k be a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$ of cardinality $q = p^n$. The Witt ring of k is denoted by $W(k)$, and let $K_0 = W(k)[1/p]$. Let K be a totally ramified extension of K_0 of degree e, and $\mathcal{O}_K$ be the ring of integers of K. Let I_K be the inertia group of the absolute Galois group G_K, and Fr_q be the q-th power Frobenius of the absolute Galois group G_k. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field of characteristic p. The formal power series ring of u over $\mathbb{F}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{F}[[u]]$, and its quotient field is denoted by $\mathbb{F}((u))$. Let v_u be the valuation of $\mathbb{F}((u))$ normalized by $v_u(u) = 1$.

1. Preliminaries

First of all, we recall some notation from [Kis], and the interested reader should consult [Kis] for more detailed definitions.

For each $\mathbb{Q}_p$-algebra embedding $\psi : K \to \overline{K}_0$, we put $v_\psi = 1$ and set $\mathbf{v} = (v_\psi)_\psi$. Let F be a finite Galois extension of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ containing K_0, and $\mathbb{F}$ be the residue field of F. Let $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ be a continuous two-dimensional representation of G_K over $\mathbb{F}$. We assume that $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ arises as the generic fiber of a finite flat group scheme over $\mathcal{O}_K$.

Let R be a complete local Noetherian $\mathcal{O}_F$-algebra with residue field $\mathbb{F}$, and fix $\xi \in D^{\mathrm{fl}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}(R)$. We make the following assumption:

The morphism $\xi \to D^{\mathrm{fl}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}}}$ of groupoids over $\mathfrak{AR}_{\mathcal{O}_F}$ is formally smooth.

Now we can construct $\Theta^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},\xi} : \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v},\mathrm{loc}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},\xi} \to \operatorname{Spec} R^{\mathbf{v}}$. Let $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ be its fiber over the closed point of $\operatorname{Spec} R^{\mathbf{v}}$. We assume $\operatorname{Spec} R^{\mathbf{v}} \neq \emptyset$, and this assumption assures that the action of I_K on $\det V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is the reduction mod p of the cyclotomic character.

The fundamental character of level m is given by

$$\omega_m : I_K \to \overline{k}^{\times};\ g \mapsto \frac{g(\sqrt[p^m-1]{\pi})}{\sqrt[p^m-1]{\pi}} \bmod m_{\mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}}}.$$

Here π is a uniformizer of $\mathcal{O}_K$, and $m_{\mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}}}$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}}$. If K'/K is a finite unramified extension that contains the (p^m-1)-st roots of unity, then the same formula as above defines a character of $G_{K'}$, which is again denoted by ω_m. Note that this extension depends on the choice of the uniformizer π. From now on, we fix a uniformizer π.

Lemma 1.1. *If $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is absolutely irreducible and $\mathbb{F}_{q^2} \subset \mathbb{F}$, then*

$$V_{\mathbb{F}}|_{I_K} \sim \omega_{2n}^{s} \oplus \omega_{2n}^{qs}$$

for a positive integer s such that $(q+1) \nmid s$.

Proof. Let $I_P \subset I_K$ be the wild inertia group. Then $V_{\mathbb{F}}^{I_P} \neq 0$ and $V_{\mathbb{F}}^{I_P}$ is G_K-stable, so $V_{\mathbb{F}}^{I_P} = V_{\mathbb{F}}$. As the action of I_K on $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ factors through the tame inertia group, we get $V_{\mathbb{F}}|_{I_K} \sim \omega_{m_1}^{s_1} \oplus \omega_{m_2}^{s_2}$ for some non-negative integers s_1, s_2 and some positive integers m_1, m_2. Now we fix a lifting $\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q \in G_K$ of the q-th Frobenius Fr_q. For every $\sigma \in I_K$ and every positive integer m, we have $\omega_m\bigl(\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q \circ \sigma \circ (\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)^{-1}\bigr) = \omega_m(\sigma)^q$. Changing the above basis by the action of $(\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)^{-1}$, we obtain $V_{\mathbb{F}}|_{I_K} \sim \omega_{m_1}^{qs_1} \oplus \omega_{m_2}^{qs_2}$.

If $\omega_{m_1}^{s_1} = \omega_{m_2}^{s_2}$, we get $\omega_{m_1}^{s_1} = \omega_{m_1}^{qs_1}$. So we may assume $m_1 = n$. As ω_n is defined over G_K, we can consider the representation $V_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes \omega_n^{-s_1}$ of G_K. Then this representation is absolutely irreducible and factors through G_k. This is a contradiction.

So we may assume $\omega_{m_1}^{s_1} \neq \omega_{m_2}^{s_2}$. As $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is an irreducible representation, $\omega_{m_1}^{s_1} = \omega_{m_2}^{qs_2}$ and $\omega_{m_2}^{s_2} = \omega_{m_1}^{qs_1}$. Hence $\omega_{m_1}^{s_1} = \omega_{m_1}^{q^2 s_1}$ and we may assume $m_1 = 2n$. Thus we get $V_{\mathbb{F}}|_{I_K} \sim \omega_{2n}^{s} \oplus \omega_{2n}^{qs}$.

If $(q+1) \mid s$, then $V_{\mathbb{F}}|_{I_K} \sim \omega_n^{s'} \oplus \omega_n^{s'}$ where $s' = s/(q+1)$. This contradicts the absolutely irreducibility of $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ by considering $V_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes \omega_n^{-s'}$. So we get $(q+1) \nmid s$. $\square$

Let $\mathfrak{S} = W(k)[[u]]$, and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}}$ be the p-adic completion of $\mathfrak{S}[1/u]$. We choose elements $\pi_m \in \overline{K}$ such that $\pi_0 = \pi$ and $\pi_{m+1}^p = \pi_m$ for $m \geq 0$, and put $K_\infty = \bigcup_{m\geq 0} K(\pi_m)$. Let $M_{\mathbb{F}} \in \Phi\mathrm{M}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}},\mathbb{F}}$ be the ϕ-module that corresponds to the G_{K_∞}-representation $V_{\mathbb{F}}(-1)$. Here (-1) denotes the inverse of the Tate twist.

From now on, we assume $\mathbb{F}_{q^2} \subset \mathbb{F}$ and fix an embedding $k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}$. This assumption does not matter, because we may extend $\mathbb{F}$ to prove the main theorem. We consider the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F} \cong k((u)) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F} \xrightarrow{\sim} \prod_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_p)} \mathbb{F}((u)) \ ; \ \left(\sum a_i u^i\right) \otimes b \mapsto \left(\sum \sigma(a_i) b u^i\right)_{\sigma}$$

and let $\epsilon_\sigma \in k((u)) \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}$ be the primitive idempotent corresponding to σ. Take $\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_n \in \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_p)$ such that $\sigma_{i+1} = \sigma_i \circ \phi^{-1}$. Here we regard ϕ as the p-th power Frobenius, and use the convention that $\sigma_{n+i} = \sigma_i$. In the following, we often use such conventions. Then we have $\phi(\epsilon_{\sigma_i}) = \epsilon_{\sigma_{i+1}}$, and $\phi : M_{\mathbb{F}} \to M_{\mathbb{F}}$ determines $\phi : \epsilon_{\sigma_i} M_{\mathbb{F}} \to \epsilon_{\sigma_{i+1}} M_{\mathbb{F}}$. For $(A_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$, we write

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim (A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n) = (A_i)_i$$

if there is a basis $\{e_1^i, e_2^i\}$ of $\epsilon_{\sigma_i} M_{\mathbb{F}}$ over $\mathbb{F}((u))$ such that $\phi \begin{pmatrix} e_1^i \\ e_2^i \end{pmatrix} = A_i \begin{pmatrix} e_1^{i+1} \\ e_2^{i+1} \end{pmatrix}$. We use the same notation for any sublattice $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}} \subset M_{\mathbb{F}}$ similarly. Here and in the following, we consider only sublattices that are $\mathfrak{S} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathbb{F}$-modules.

Finally, for any sublattice $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}} \subset M_{\mathbb{F}}$ with a chosen basis $\{e_1^i, e_2^i\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ and $B = (B_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$, the module generated by the entries of $\left\langle B_i \begin{pmatrix} e_1^i \\ e_2^i \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$ with the basis given by these entries is denoted by $B \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$. Note that $B \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$ depends on the choice of the basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$.

Lemma 1.2. *Suppose $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is absolutely irreducible. If $\mathbb{F}'$ is the quadratic extension of $\mathbb{F}$, then*

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}' \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_1 u^s & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 \end{pmatrix}, \ldots, \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_n & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_n \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

for some $\alpha_i \in (\mathbb{F}')^\times$ and a positive integer s such that $(q+1) \nmid s$.

Proof. Let K' be the quadratic unramified extension of K, and k' be the residue field of K'. Then

$$V_{\mathbb{F}}(-1)|_{G_{K'}} \sim \lambda' \omega_{2n}^{-s} \oplus \lambda' \omega_{2n}^{-qs}$$

for an unramified character $\lambda' : G_{K'} \to \mathbb{F}^\times$ and a positive integer s such that $(q+1) \nmid s$ by applying Lemma 1.1 to $V_{\mathbb{F}}(-1)^*$. By taking the quadratic extension $\mathbb{F}'$ of $\mathbb{F}$, we can extend λ' to $\lambda : G_K \to (\mathbb{F}')^\times$. We take a lifting $\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q \in G_{K_\infty}$ of the q-th Frobenius Fr_q. Now we fix a (q^2-1)-st root of π, which is denoted by $\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi}$. Then we put $\widetilde{\alpha} = \widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi})/\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi} \in \mathcal{O}_{\overline{K}}$, and let α be the reduction of $\widetilde{\alpha}$ in $\overline{k}$. We have $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}'$, because $\alpha^{q^2-1} = 1$. Considering $V_{\mathbb{F}} \otimes_{\mathbb{F}} \mathbb{F}'$, we may assume $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}'$.

We put $K'_\infty = K' \cdot K_\infty$. Then $(\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)^2$ is in $G_{K'_\infty}$. Now we have

$$\frac{(\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)^2(\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi})}{\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi}} = \frac{(\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)^2(\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi})}{\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi})} \cdot \frac{\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi})}{\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi}} = \frac{\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(\widetilde{\alpha}\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi})}{\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(\sqrt[q^2-1]{\pi})}\widetilde{\alpha} = \widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(\widetilde{\alpha})\widetilde{\alpha}$$

and $\omega_{2n}\big((\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)^2\big)=\alpha^{q+1}$. Hence we can take $v_1, v_2 \in V_{\mathbb{F}}(-1)$ so that

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(v_1)=\lambda(\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)\alpha^{-qs}v_2,\ \widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(v_2)=\lambda(\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q)\alpha^{-s}v_1$$

and

$$g(v_1)=\lambda(g)\omega_{2n}^{-s}(g)v_1,\ g(v_2)=\lambda(g)\omega_{2n}^{-qs}(g)v_2$$

for all $g\in G_{K'_\infty}$. We take an element w_λ of $(\overline{k}\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}\mathbb{F})^\times$ so that $g(w_\lambda)=\big(1\otimes\lambda(g)\big)w_\lambda$ for all $g\in G_K$. By this condition, w_λ is determined up to $(k\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}\mathbb{F})^\times$.

By the definition of the action of G_{K_∞} on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{ur}}}$, we can choose an element u_{2n} of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{ur}}}/p\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{ur}}}$ so that $u_{2n}^{q^2-1}=u$ and $\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q(u_{2n})=\alpha u_{2n}$. We consider the isomorphism

$$k'\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}\mathbb{F}\xrightarrow{\sim}\prod_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Gal}(k'/\mathbb{F}_p)}\mathbb{F}\ ;\ a\otimes b\mapsto\big(\sigma(a)b\big)_\sigma$$

and let $\epsilon_0\in k'\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}\mathbb{F}$ be the primitive idempotent corresponding to $\mathrm{id}_{k'}$. For $0\leq r\leq 2n-1$, we put $\epsilon_r=\phi^r\epsilon_0$. Note that $(a^{p^r}\otimes 1)\epsilon_r=(1\otimes a)\epsilon_r$ for all $a\in k'$.

We put

$$\begin{aligned}e_1=w_\lambda^{-1}\big\{&(u_{2n}^{s}\otimes 1)(\epsilon_0v_1+\epsilon_nv_2)+(u_{2n}^{ps}\otimes 1)(\epsilon_1v_1+\epsilon_{n+1}v_2)+\\&\cdots+(u_{2n}^{p^{n-1}s}\otimes 1)(\epsilon_{n-1}v_1+\epsilon_{2n-1}v_2)\big\},\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}e_2=w_\lambda^{-1}\big\{&(u_{2n}^{p^ns}\otimes 1)(\epsilon_nv_1+\epsilon_0v_2)+(u_{2n}^{p^{n+1}s}\otimes 1)(\epsilon_{n+1}v_1+\epsilon_1v_2)+\\&\cdots+(u_{2n}^{p^{2n-1}s}\otimes 1)(\epsilon_{2n-1}v_1+\epsilon_{n-1}v_2)\big\}\end{aligned}$$

in $(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{ur}}}/p\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{ur}}})\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}V_{\mathbb{F}}(-1)$. Then e_1 and e_2 are fixed by $g\in G_{K'_\infty}$ and $\widetilde{\mathrm{Fr}}_q$. Hence e_1, e_2 are fixed by G_{K_∞}, and these are a basis of $\Phi\mathrm{M}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}},\mathbb{F}}$ over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{E}}\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p}\mathbb{F}$. We put $\alpha_\lambda=w_\lambda/\phi(w_\lambda)$. As $\phi(w_\lambda)$ satisfies the condition determining w_λ, the element α_λ of $(\overline{k}\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}\mathbb{F})^\times$ is in $(k\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}\mathbb{F})^\times$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(e_1)&=\alpha_\lambda\big\{(\epsilon_1+\epsilon_{n+1})+\cdots+(\epsilon_{n-1}+\epsilon_{2n-1})\big\}e_1+\alpha_\lambda(\epsilon_0+\epsilon_n)e_2,\\\phi(e_2)&=\alpha_\lambda u^s(\epsilon_0+\epsilon_n)e_1+\alpha_\lambda\big\{(\epsilon_1+\epsilon_{n+1})+\cdots+(\epsilon_{n-1}+\epsilon_{2n-1})\big\}e_2.\end{aligned}$$

If we put

$$\sigma_1=\phi,\ \sigma_2=\mathrm{id}_k,\ \sigma_3=\phi^{-1},\ldots,\ \sigma_n=\phi^2,$$

then we have

$$\epsilon_{\sigma_1}=\epsilon_{n-1}+\epsilon_{2n-1},\ \epsilon_{\sigma_2}=\epsilon_0+\epsilon_n,\ldots,\ \epsilon_{\sigma_n}=\epsilon_{n-2}+\epsilon_{2n-2}$$

and

$$M_{\mathbb{F}}\sim\left(\begin{pmatrix}0&\alpha_1\\\alpha_1u^s&0\end{pmatrix},\begin{pmatrix}\alpha_2&0\\0&\alpha_2\end{pmatrix},\ldots,\begin{pmatrix}\alpha_n&0\\0&\alpha_n\end{pmatrix}\right).$$

Here α_i is the σ_{i+1}-th component of α_λ in $\prod_{\sigma\in\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_p)}\mathbb{F}$. □

2. MAIN THEOREM

Lemma 2.1. *If $\mathbb{F}'$ is a finite extension of $\mathbb{F}$, the elements of $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ naturally correspond to free $k[[u]]\otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p}\mathbb{F}'$-submodules $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}\subset M_{\mathbb{F}}\otimes_{\mathbb{F}}\mathbb{F}'$ of rank 2 that satisfy the following:*

1. *$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$ is ϕ-stable.*

(2) *For some (so any) choice of* $k[[u]] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}'$*-basis for* $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$*, and for each* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_p)$*, the map*

$$\phi : \epsilon_\sigma \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'} \to \epsilon_{\sigma\circ\phi^{-1}} \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}'}$$

has determinant αu^e *for some* $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}'[[u]]^\times$*.*

Proof. This is [Gee, Lemma 2.2]. □

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose* $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}(\mathbb{F})$ *correspond to objects* $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}, \mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ *of* $(\mathrm{Mod}/\mathfrak{S})_\mathbb{F}$ *respectively. Let* $N = (N_i)_{1\le i\le n}$ *be a nilpotent element of* $M_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ *such that* $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}} = (1+N)\cdot\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$*, and* $A = (A_i)_{1\le i\le n}$ *be an element of* $GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ *such that* $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}} \sim A$*. If* $\phi(N_i)A_iN_{i+1} \in M_2\big(\mathbb{F}[[u]]\big)$ *for all* i*, then there is a morphism* $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}$ *sending* 0 *to* x_1 *and* 1 *to* x_2*.*

Proof. This is [Gee, Lemma 2.4]. □

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose* $n \ge 2$*. Let* $\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{F}$ *be the object of* $(\mathrm{Mod}/\mathfrak{S})_\mathbb{F}$ *corresponding to a point* $x \in \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}(\mathbb{F})$*. Fix a basis of* $\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{F}$ *over* $k[[u]] \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} \mathbb{F}$*. Consider* $U^{(i)} = (U^{(i)}_j)_{1\le j\le n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ *such that* $U^{(i)}_i = \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & u^{-1}\end{pmatrix}$ *and* $U^{(i)}_j = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}$ *for all* $j \ne i$*. If* $U^{(i)}\cdot\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{F}$ *is* ϕ*-stable, it corresponds to a point* $x' \in \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}(\mathbb{F})$*, and* x' *lies on the same connected component of* $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}$ *as* x*.*

Proof. First, $U^{(i)}\cdot\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{F}$ corresponds to a point $x' \in \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}(\mathbb{F})$, because it satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1.

Next, we consider $N^{(i)} = (N^{(i)}_j)_{1\le j\le n} \in M_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ such that

$$N^{(i)}_i = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -u \\ u^{-1} & -1\end{pmatrix} \text{ and } N^{(i)}_j = 0 \text{ for all } j \ne i.$$

Then $U^{(i)}\cdot\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{F} = (1+N^{(i)})\cdot\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{F}$, because $\begin{pmatrix} u^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & u\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 2u\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 2 & -u \\ u^{-1} & 0\end{pmatrix}$. So we can apply Lemma 2.2. □

Theorem 2.4. *Let* $\mathbb{F}'$ *be a finite extension of* $\mathbb{F}$*. Suppose* $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ *correspond to objects* $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}'}, \mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}'}$ *of* $(\mathrm{Mod}/\mathfrak{S})_{\mathbb{F}'}$ *respectively. If* $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}'}$ *and* $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}'}$ *are both non-ordinary, then* x_1 *and* x_2 *lie on the same connected component of* $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}$*.*

Proof. When $n = 1$, this was proved in [Kis]. If $e < p-1$, then $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_\mathbb{F},0}(\mathbb{F}')$ is one point by [Ray, Theorem 3.3.3]. So we may assume $n \ge 2$ and $e \ge p-1$. Furthermore, replacing $V_\mathbb{F}$ by $V_\mathbb{F} \otimes_\mathbb{F} \mathbb{F}'$, we may assume $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}'$.

Suppose first that $V_\mathbb{F}$ is reducible. We can choose a basis so that $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}} \sim A = (A_i)_{1\le i\le n} \in M_2\big(\mathbb{F}[[u]]\big)^n$ where $A_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & c_i\end{pmatrix}$ for $a_i, b_i, c_i \in \mathbb{F}[[u]]$, because $M_\mathbb{F}$ is reducible and $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$ is ϕ-stable. By the Iwasawa decomposition and the determinant conditions, we can take $B = (B_i)_{1\le i\le n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ such that $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}} = B\cdot\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$ and $B_i = \begin{pmatrix} u^{-s_i} & v_i \\ 0 & u^{s_i}\end{pmatrix}$ for $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{F}((u))$. Then $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}} \sim \big(\phi(B_i)A_iB^{-1}_{i+1}\big)_i$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(B_i)A_iB_{i+1}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} u^{-ps_i} & \phi(v_i) \\ 0 & u^{ps_i} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & c_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_{i+1}} & -v_{i+1} \\ 0 & u^{-s_{i+1}} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} a_iu^{-ps_i+s_{i+1}} & -a_iv_{i+1}u^{-ps_i}+b_iu^{-ps_i-s_{i+1}}+c_i\phi(v_i)u^{-s_{i+1}} \\ 0 & c_iu^{ps_i-s_{i+1}} \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

In the last matrix, every component is integral because $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ is ϕ-stable.

First of all, we want to reduce the problem to the case where $s_i = 0$ for all i. When $e = p-1$, we have $0 \leq v_u(c_i) \leq p-1$ and $0 \leq v_u(c_i)+ps_i-s_{i+1} \leq p-1$ for all i by the determinant conditions. From the second set of inequalities, we obtaine

$$0 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\bigl\{v_u(c_{i-1-j})+ps_{i-1-j}-s_{i-j}\bigr\}p^j \leq p^n-1,$$

and we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\bigl\{v_u(c_{i-1-j})+ps_{i-1-j}-s_{i-j}\bigr\}p^j = (p^n-1)s_i + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} v_u(c_{i-1-j})p^j.$$

Combining these with $0 \leq v_u(c_i) \leq p-1$, we get $-1 \leq s_i \leq 1$. If $s_i = 1$ for some i, the second sign of the above inequality must be the equality sign. So we get $v_u(c_j) = 0$ for all j. This contradicts the non-ordinarity of $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$. If $s_i = -1$ for some i, the first sign of the above inequality must be the equality sign. So we get $v_u(c_j)+ps_j-s_{j+1} = 0$ for all j. This contradicts the non-ordinarity of $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$. Hence, we have $s_i = 0$ for all i. So we may assume $e \geq p$.

We consider $U^{(i)}$ as in Lemma 2.3. If $s_i > 0$ and $U^{(i)} \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ is ϕ-stable, we may replace $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ with $U^{(i)} \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ by Lemma 2.3. This replacement changes s_i into $s_i - 1$ and v_i into uv_i. If $s_i < 0$, switching $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$ with $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ so that we have $s_i > 0$, we consider the same replacement as above. Note that these replacements decrease $|s_i|$ by 1. We prove that we can continue these replacements until we get to the case where $s_i = 0$ for all i. Suppose that we cannot continue the replacements and there is some nonzero s_i. Take an index i_0 such that $|s_{i_0}|$ is the greatest. By switching $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$ with $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$, we may assume $s_{i_0} > 0$. As we cannot continue the replacements, we cannot decrease s_{i_0} keeping the ϕ-stability, that is,

$$v_u(c_{i_0})+ps_{i_0}-s_{i_0+1} \leq p-1 \text{ or } v_u(a_{i_0-1})-ps_{i_0-1}+s_{i_0} = 0.$$

If $v_u(c_{i_0})+ps_{i_0}-s_{i_0+1} \leq p-1$, we have $s_{i_0} = 1$, $v_u(c_{i_0}) = 0$ and $s_{i_0+1} = 1$, because $v_u(c_{i_0})+(p-1)s_{i_0}+(s_{i_0}-s_{i_0+1}) \leq p-1$. Now we have $v_u(a_{i_0})-ps_{i_0}+s_{i_0+1} \geq 1$, because $e \geq p$ and $v_u(c_{i_0})+ps_{i_0}-s_{i_0+1} \leq p-1$. As s_{i_0+1} cannot be decreased, $v_u(c_{i_0+1})+ps_{i_0+1}-s_{i_0+2} \leq p-1$. The same argument shows that $v_u(c_i) = 0$ and $s_i = 1$ for all i. This contradicts the non-ordinarity of $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$.

If $v_u(a_{i_0-1})-ps_{i_0-1}+s_{i_0} = 0$, then $s_{i_0-1} > 0$ and $v_u(c_{i_0-1})+ps_{i_0-1}-s_{i_0} = e \geq p$. As s_{i_0-1} cannot be decreased, $v_u(a_{i_0-2})-ps_{i_0-2}+s_{i_0-1} = 0$. The same argument shows that $v_u(a_i)-ps_i+s_{i+1} = 0$ for all i. So we have that $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ is an extension of a multiplicative module by an étale module. We show that such an extension splits. Now we have $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} a'_i & b'_i \\ 0 & u^ec'_i \end{pmatrix}\right)_i$ for $a'_i, c'_i \in \mathbb{F}[[u]]^\times$ and $b'_i \in \mathbb{F}[[u]]$. Then

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & v'_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right)_i \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\begin{pmatrix} a'_i & -a'_iv'_{i+1}+b'_i+u^ec'_i\phi(v'_i) \\ 0 & u^ec'_i \end{pmatrix}\right)_i$$

for $v'_i \in \mathbb{F}[[u]]$. It suffices to show that there is $(v'_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \in \mathbb{F}[[u]]^n$ such that $a'_i v'_{i+1} = b'_i + u^e c'_i \phi(v'_i)$ for all i, and we can solve the system of equations by finding v'_i successively in ascending order of their degrees. Hence we have that $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}}$ is ordinary, and this is a contradiction.

Thus we may assume $s_i = 0$ for all i. Consider $N = (N_i)_{1\leq i\leq n} \in M_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ such that $N_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_i \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ for $v_i \in \mathbb{F}((u))$. Then we have $\mathfrak{M}_{2,\mathbb{F}} = (1+N)\cdot\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$ and $\phi(N_i)\begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & c_i \end{pmatrix} N_{i+1} = 0$. Hence x_1 and x_2 lie on the same connected component by Lemma 2.2. This completes the proof in the case where $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is reducible.

From now on, we consider the case where $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is irreducible. If $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is reducible after extending the base field $\mathbb{F}$, we can reduce this case to the reducible case. So we may assume $V_{\mathbb{F}}$ is absolutely irreducible. Extending the field $\mathbb{F}$, we have

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\alpha_1\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ u^s & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_2\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \alpha_n\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right)$$

for some $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ and a positive integer s by Lemma 1.2. This basis gives a sublattice $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$. By the Iwasawa decomposition, we can take $s'_i, t'_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v'_i \in \mathbb{F}((u))$ so that $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s'_i} & v'_i \\ 0 & u^{t'_i} \end{pmatrix}\right)_i \cdot\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{F}}$. Changing the basis by $\left(\begin{pmatrix} u^{s'_i} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t'_i} \end{pmatrix}\right)_i$, we get

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\alpha_1\begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^{s_1} \\ u^{t_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_2\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_2} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t_2} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \alpha_n\begin{pmatrix} u^{s_n} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t_n} \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

Here we have $0 \leq t_1$, $0 \leq s_i, t_i \leq e$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$, and $s_i + t_i = e$ for all i by the ϕ-stability and the determinant conditions of $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$.

We are going to change the basis so that we have moreover $t_1 \leq e$. Changing the basis of the i-th component by $\begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & u^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$, we get the following transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} &T_i : t_i \rightsquigarrow t_i - p,\ t_{i-1} \rightsquigarrow t_{i-1} + 1 \text{ for } i \neq 2, \\ &T_2 : t_2 \rightsquigarrow t_2 - p,\ t_1 \rightsquigarrow t_1 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

If $t_1 > e$, we put

$$m = \max\{\ 1 \leq i \leq n \mid t_i \neq e\ \},$$

and carry out T_1 when $m = n$, and $T_{m+1}, T_{m+2}, \dots, T_n, T_1$ when $m \neq n$. Then $0 \leq s_i, t_i \leq e$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$, and t_1 decrease by p when $m \neq 1$, by $p+1$ when $m = 1$. Repeat this until we get to the situation where $t_1 \leq e$. If $e \geq p$, we get to the situation where $0 \leq s_1, t_1 \leq e$. If $e = p-1$ and we do not get to the situation where $0 \leq s_1, t_1 \leq p-1$, then we have

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\alpha_1\begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^{-1} \\ u^p & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_2\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u^{p-1} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \alpha_n\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u^{p-1} \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

In this case, changing the basis by $\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & u^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right)_i$, we get

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\alpha_1\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ u^p & -u^{p-1} \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_2\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u^{p-1} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \alpha_n\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u^{p-1} \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

This contradicts that $M_{\mathbb{F}}$ is irreducible. Hence we obtain a basis such that

$$M_{\mathbb{F}} \sim \left(\alpha_1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^{s_1} \\ u^{t_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \alpha_2 \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_2} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t_2} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \alpha_n \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_n} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t_n} \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

for some s_i and t_i satisfying $s_i + t_i = e$ and $0 \leq s_i, t_i \leq e$ for all i. Let $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ be the sublattice of $M_{\mathbb{F}}$ determined by this basis. Note that $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1, and let x_0 be the point of $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathbf{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$.

We prove that we can change $(t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ furthermore by T_i's or T_i^{-1}'s keeping $0 \leq t_i \leq e$ for all i, and get to the situation where $|s_i - t_i| \leq p+1$ for all i. By Lemma 2.3, these changes do not affect which of the connected components x_0 lies on. If $e \leq p+1$, this is satisfied automatically. So we may assume $e \geq p+2$. We prove that if there is an index j such that $|s_j - t_j| \geq p+2$, then there is an index j_0 such that $|s_{j_0} - t_{j_0}| \geq p+2$ and we can change t_{j_0} by T_{j_0} or $T_{j_0}^{-1}$ so that $|s_{j_0} - t_{j_0}|$ decreases keeping $0 \leq t_i \leq e$ for all i. We put $h_i = (-1)^{[(i-2)/n]}(s_i - t_i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. By assumption, there is an integer j_0 such that $1 \leq j_0 \leq 2n$, $h_{j_0} \geq p+2$ and $h_{j_0 - 1} < e$. If $2 \leq j_0 \leq n+1$, we can change t_{j_0} by $T_{j_0}^{-1}$, otherwise by T_{j_0}, so that $|s_{j_0} - t_{j_0}|$ decreases keeping $0 \leq t_i \leq e$ for all i. Thus we have proved the claim. Hence if $|s_j - t_j| \geq p+2$ for an index j, we can carry out T_{j_0} or $T_{j_0}^{-1}$ for an index j_0 as above and this operation decreases $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |s_i - t_i|$ by at least 2. So after finitely many operations, we get to the situation where $|s_i - t_i| \leq p+1$ for all i.

Hence we may assume that s_i and t_i satisfy $s_i + t_i = e$, $0 \leq s_i, t_i \leq e$ and $|s_i - t_i| \leq p+1$ for all i. We are going to prove that x_0 and x_1 lie on the same connected component. We can prove that x_0 and x_2 lie on the same connected component by the same argument.

By the Iwasawa decomposition and the determinant conditions, we can take $B = (B_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \in GL_2\big(\mathbb{F}((u))\big)^n$ such that $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}} = B \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ and $B_i = \begin{pmatrix} u^{-a_i} & v_i \\ 0 & u^{a_i} \end{pmatrix}$ for $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{F}((u))$. Then we put $r_i = v_u(v_i)$. Now we have

$$\phi(B_1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^{s_1} \\ u^{t_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix} B_2^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \phi(v_1) u^{t_1 + a_2} & u^{s_1 - pa_1 - a_2} - \phi(v_1) v_2 u^{t_1} \\ u^{t_1 + pa_1 + a_2} & -v_2 u^{t_1 + pa_1} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\phi(B_i) \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t_i} \end{pmatrix} B_{i+1}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i - pa_i + a_{i+1}} & \phi(v_i) u^{t_i - a_{i+1}} - v_{i+1} u^{s_i - pa_i} \\ 0 & u^{t_i + pa_i - a_{i+1}} \end{pmatrix}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq n$. On the right-hand sides, every component of the matrices is integral because $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$ is ϕ-stable.

First, we consider the case $t_1 + pa_1 + a_2 > e$. In this case,

$$(pr_1 + t_1 + a_2) + (r_2 + t_1 + pa_1) = e, \ s_1 - pa_1 - a_2 = pr_1 + r_2 + t_1 < 0$$

by the ϕ-stability and the determinant conditions of $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}$. We have $a_1 > r_1$, because $t_1 + pa_1 + a_2 > e \geq pr_1 + t_1 + a_2$. Similarly, we have $a_2 > r_2$, because $t_1 + pa_1 + a_2 > e \geq r_2 + t_1 + pa_1$.

We consider the following operations:

$$a_i \rightsquigarrow a_i - 1, \ v_i \rightsquigarrow uv_i, \ \text{if it preserves the } \phi\text{-stability of } B \cdot \mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}.$$

These operations replace x_1 by a point that lies on the same connected component as x_1 by Lemma 2.3. We prove that we can continue these operations until we get to the situation where $t_1 + pa_1 + a_2 \leq e$. In other words, we reduce the problem to the case $t_1 + pa_1 + a_2 \leq e$. If we can continue the operations endlessly, we get to the situation where $t_1+pa_1+a_2 \le e$, because the conditions $s_i-pa_i+a_{i+1}\ge 0$ for $2\le i\le n$ exclude that both a_1 and a_2 remain bounded below. Suppose we cannot continue the operations. This is equivalent to the following condition:

$$\begin{aligned}s_n-pa_n+a_1=0 \text{ or } r_2+t_1+pa_1\le p-1,\\ pr_1+t_1+a_2=0 \text{ or } t_2+pa_2-a_3\le p-1,\\ s_{i-1}-pa_{i-1}+a_i=0 \text{ or } t_i+pa_i-a_{i+1}\le p-1 \text{ for each } 3\le i\le n.\end{aligned}$$

If $e\ge p$, there are only the following two cases, because $(pr_1+t_1+a_2)+(r_2+t_1+pa_1)=e$ and $(s_i-pa_i+a_{i+1})+(t_i+pa_i-a_{i+1})=e$ for $2\le i\le n$.

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{Case 1}: pr_1+t_1+a_2=0,\ s_i-pa_i+a_{i+1}=0 \text{ for } 2\le i\le n.\\ &\text{Case 2}: r_2+t_1+pa_1\le p-1,\ t_i+pa_i-a_{i+1}\le p-1 \text{ for } 2\le i\le n.\end{aligned}$$

If $e=p-1$, clearly it is in Case 2.

In the Case 1. Suppose that there is an index i such that $2\le i\le n$ and $pr_i+t_i-a_{i+1}\ne r_{i+1}+s_i-pa_i$. Then both sides are non-negative, because $v_u(\phi(v_i)u^{t_i-a_{i+1}}-v_{i+1}u^{s_i-pa_i})\ge 0$. Comparing $r_{i+1}+s_i-pa_i\ge 0$ with $s_i-pa_i+a_{i+1}=0$, we get $r_{i+1}\ge a_{i+1}$. Then $pr_{i+1}+t_{i+1}-a_{i+2}\ge pa_{i+1}+t_{i+1}-a_{i+2}\ge 0$, and $r_{i+2}+s_{i+1}-pa_{i+1}\ge 0$ because $v_u(\phi(v_{i+1})u^{t_{i+1}-a_{i+2}}-v_{i+2}u^{s_{i+1}-pa_{i+1}})\ge 0$. Comparing $r_{i+2}+s_{i+1}-pa_{i+1}\ge 0$ with $s_{i+1}-pa_{i+1}+a_{i+2}=0$, we get $r_{i+2}\ge a_{i+2}$. The same argument goes on and shows $r_1\ge a_1$. This is a contradiction. Thus $pr_i+t_i-a_{i+1}=r_{i+1}+s_i-pa_i$ for all $2\le i\le n$. Now we change the basis of

$$M_{\mathbb{F}}\sim\left(\alpha_1\begin{pmatrix}0 & u^{s_1}\\ u^{t_1} & 0\end{pmatrix},\alpha_2\begin{pmatrix}u^{s_2} & 0\\ 0 & u^{t_2}\end{pmatrix},\dots,\alpha_n\begin{pmatrix}u^{s_n} & 0\\ 0 & u^{t_n}\end{pmatrix}\right)$$

by $\left(\begin{pmatrix}u^{-a_i} & u^{r_i}\\ 0 & u^{a_i}\end{pmatrix}\right)_i$. Then we have

$$M_{\mathbb{F}}\sim\left(\alpha_1\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ u^{t_1+pa_1+a_2} & -u^e\end{pmatrix},\alpha_2\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ 0 & u^e\end{pmatrix},\dots,\alpha_n\begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ 0 & u^e\end{pmatrix}\right),$$

and this contradicts that $M_{\mathbb{F}}$ is irreducible.

In the Case 2. Suppose that there is an index i such that $2\le i\le n$ and $pr_i+t_i-a_{i+1}\ne r_{i+1}+s_i-pa_i$. Then both sides are non-negative, because $v_u(\phi(v_i)u^{t_i-a_{i+1}}-v_{i+1}u^{s_i-pa_i})\ge 0$. Comparing $pr_i+t_i-a_{i+1}\ge 0$ with $t_i+pa_i-a_{i+1}\le p-1$, we get $r_i\ge a_i$. Then $r_i+s_{i-1}-pa_{i-1}\ge s_{i-1}-pa_{i-1}+a_i\ge 0$, and $pr_{i-1}+t_{i-1}-a_i\ge 0$ because $v_u(\phi(v_{i-1})u^{t_{i-1}-a_i}-v_iu^{s_{i-1}-pa_{i-1}})\ge 0$. Comparing $pr_{i-1}+t_{i-1}-a_i\ge 0$ with $t_{i-1}+pa_{i-1}-a_i\le p-1$, we get $r_{i-1}\ge a_{i-1}$. The same argument goes on and shows that $r_2\ge a_2$. This is a contradiction.

The above argument shows that

$$r_i<a_i,\ pr_i+t_i-a_{i+1}=r_{i+1}+s_i-pa_i<0 \text{ for } 2\le i\le n.$$

Combining these equations with $s_1-pa_1-a_2=pr_1+r_2+t_1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}-(p^n+1)r_1=(p^n+1)a_1+(s_n-t_n)+p(s_{n-1}-t_{n-1})+\\ \cdots+p^{n-3}(s_3-t_3)+p^{n-2}(s_2-t_2)-p^{n-1}(s_1-t_1),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}-(p^n+1)r_2=(p^n+1)a_2-(s_1-t_1)-p(s_n-t_n)-\\ \cdots-p^{n-3}(s_4-t_4)-p^{n-2}(s_3-t_3)-p^{n-1}(s_2-t_2),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}-(p^n+1)r_3 &= (p^n+1)a_3+(s_2-t_2)-p(s_1-t_1)- \\ &\qquad \cdots - p^{n-3}(s_5-t_5)-p^{n-2}(s_4-t_4)-p^{n-1}(s_3-t_3), \\ &\vdots \\ -(p^n+1)r_n &= (p^n+1)a_n+(s_{n-1}-t_{n-1})+p(s_{n-2}-t_{n-2})+ \\ &\qquad \cdots + p^{n-3}(s_2-t_2)-p^{n-2}(s_1-t_1)-p^{n-1}(s_n-t_n).\end{aligned}$$

As $|s_i-t_i|\le p+1$ and

$$(p+1)+p(p+1)+\cdots+p^{n-1}(p+1)=\left(\frac{p^n-1}{p-1}\right)(p+1)<2(p^n+1),$$

we get $-a_i-1\le r_i\le -a_i+1$. When $e=p-1$, as $|s_i-t_i|\le p-1$ and

$$(p-1)+p(p-1)+\cdots+p^{n-1}(p-1)=\left(\frac{p^n-1}{p-1}\right)(p-1)<(p^n+1),$$

we get $r_i=-a_i$.

As $r_2+t_1+pa_1\le p-1$, we have

$$pa_1\le t_1+pa_1\le p-1-r_2\le p+a_2.$$

For $2\le i\le n$, as $t_i+pa_i-a_{i+1}\le p-1$, we have

$$pa_i\le t_i+pa_i\le p-1+a_{i+1}.$$

Take an index i_0 such that a_{i_0} is the greatest. As $pa_{i_0}\le a_{i_0+1}+p\le a_{i_0}+p$, we get $a_{i_0}\le \frac{p}{p-1}<2$. Combining $-a_i-1\le r_i$ and $r_i<a_i$, we get $a_i\ge 0$. Hence

$$a_i=0,\ r_i=-1,\ \text{or}\ a_i=1,\ -2\le r_i\le 0$$

for every i.

In the case $a_2=0$, we have $r_2=-1$. Comparing $t_1+pa_1+a_2>e$ with $r_2+t_1+pa_1\le p-1$, we get $e<p$. When $e=p-1$, we have $r_2=-a_2$. This is a contradiction.

In the case $a_2=1$. As $0\le t_i+pa_i-a_{i+1}\le p-1$ for $2\le i\le n$, we have $a_i=1$ for all i and $t_i=0$ for $2\le i\le n$. As $r_2+pa_1+t_1\le p-1$, we have $r_2\le -1$. As $pr_2+t_2-a_3=r_3+s_2-pa_2$, we have $r_3=pr_2+p-1-e\le -e-1\le -3$. This is a contradiction.

Thus we may assume $t_1+pa_1+a_2\le e$. We put $\mathfrak{M}_{3,\mathbb{F}}=\left(\begin{pmatrix}u^{-a_i} & 0\\ 0 & u^{a_i}\end{pmatrix}\right)_i\cdot\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$, then

$$\mathfrak{M}_{3,\mathbb{F}}\sim\left(\alpha_1\begin{pmatrix}0 & u^{s_1-pa_1-a_2}\\ u^{t_1+pa_1+a_2} & 0\end{pmatrix},\alpha_2\begin{pmatrix}u^{s_2-pa_2+a_3} & 0\\ 0 & u^{t_2+pa_2-a_3}\end{pmatrix},\right.$$
$$\left.\ldots,\alpha_n\begin{pmatrix}u^{s_n-pa_n+a_1} & 0\\ 0 & u^{t_n+pa_n-a_1}\end{pmatrix}\right)$$

and $\mathfrak{M}_{1,\mathbb{F}}=\left(\begin{pmatrix}1 & v_iu^{-a_i}\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\right)_i\cdot\mathfrak{M}_{3,\mathbb{F}}$. Note that $\mathfrak{M}_{3,\mathbb{F}}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.1, and let x_3 be the point of $\mathcal{GR}^{\mathrm{v}}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ corresponding to $\mathfrak{M}_{3,\mathbb{F}}$. If we put

$N_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_i u^{-a_i} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, then

$$\phi(N_1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u^{s_1 - pa_1 - a_2} \\ u^{t_1 + pa_1 + a_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} N_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \phi(v_1) v_2 u^{t_1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\phi(N_i) \begin{pmatrix} u^{s_i - pa_i + a_{i+1}} & 0 \\ 0 & u^{t_i + pa_i - a_{i+1}} \end{pmatrix} N_{i+1} = 0$$

for $2 \leq i \leq n$. Here we have $v_u\big(\phi(v_1) v_2 u^{t_1}\big) \geq 0$, because $s_1 - pa_1 - a_2 \geq 0$ and $v_u\big(u^{s_1 - pa_1 - a_2} - \phi(v_1) v_2 u^{t_1}\big) \geq 0$. Hence x_1 and x_3 lie on the same connected component by Lemma 2.2.

We are going to compare $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{3,\mathbb{F}}$. Recall the previous operations on the basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\mathbb{F}}$ that changed $(t_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ so that $|s_i - t_i| \leq p+1$ keeping $0 \leq t_i \leq e$ for all i. Apply the same operations to the basis of $\mathfrak{M}_{3,\mathbb{F}}$. By Lemma 2.3, these operations do not affect which of the connected components x_3 lies on. So we may assume that

$$s_1 - pa_1 - a_2,\ s_2 - pa_2 + a_3, \ldots,\ s_n - pa_n + a_1$$

are all in $\big[(e-p-1)/2, (e+p+1)/2\big]$. As $(e-p-1)/2 \leq s_i \leq (e+p+1)/2$, we have that

$$|pa_1 + a_2| \leq p+1,\ |pa_2 - a_3| \leq p+1, \ldots,\ |pa_n - a_1| \leq p+1.$$

Summing up the above inequalities after multiplying some p-powers so that we can eliminate a_j for $j \neq i$, we get $|(p^n+1)a_i| \leq \big\{(p^n-1)/(p-1)\big\}(p+1)$. So we have $|a_i| \leq 1$ for all i.

In the case $e \geq p$. We consider the operations that decrease $|a_i|$ by 1 for an index i keeping the condition of ϕ-stability. By Lemma 2.3, these operations do not affect which of the connected components x_3 lies on. We prove that we can continue the operations until we have $a_i = 0$ for all i, that is, x_0 and x_3 lie on the same connected component. Suppose that we cannot continue the operations and there is some nonzero a_i. The condition of ϕ-stability is equivalent to

$$C_1 : 0 \leq s_1 - pa_1 - a_2 \leq e,\ C_2 : 0 \leq s_2 - pa_2 + a_3 \leq e, \\ \ldots,\ C_n : 0 \leq s_n - pa_n + a_1 \leq e.$$

Note that if $a_i \neq 0$ or $a_{i+1} \neq 0$, we can decrease $|a_i|$ or $|a_{i+1}|$ keeping C_i.

We put

$$c_i = \sharp\big\{ i \leq j \leq i+1 \ \big|\ \text{we can decrease } |a_j| \text{ keeping } C_i \big\},$$

and claim that $\sharp\{j \mid a_j \neq 0\} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i$. First, if $a_i \neq 0$, we have $c_{i-1} \geq 1$ and $c_i \geq 1$ from the above remark. So we have $\sharp\{j \mid a_j \neq 0\} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n c_i$. Second, we count $a_i \neq 0$ in not both of C_{i-1} and C_i, because we cannot continue the operations. So we have $\sharp\{j \mid a_j \neq 0\} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n c_i$. Hence we have equality. From this equality, we have $a_i \neq 0$ and $c_i = 1$ for all i. For $2 \leq i \leq n$, we have $a_i = a_{i+1} \neq 0$ because $c_i = 1$. So we have $a_1 = a_2 \neq 0$, but this contradicts $c_1 = 1$.

In the case $e = p-1$. We have $|pa_1 + a_2| \leq p-1$ by C_1, and $|pa_i - a_{i+1}| \leq p-1$ by C_i for $2 \leq i \leq n$. Summing up these inequalities after multiplying some p-powers so that we can eliminate a_j for $j \neq i$, we get $|(p^n+1)a_i| \leq p^n - 1$. So we have $a_i = 0$ for all i.

Hence x_0 and x_3 lie on the same connected component. This completes the proof. □

3. Application

As an application of Theorem 2.4, we can improve a theorem in [Kis] comparing a deformation ring and a Hecke ring. We recall some notation from [Kis], and the interested reader should consult [Kis] for more detailed definitions.

Let F be a totally real field, and D be a totally definite quaternion algebra with center F. Let Σ be the set of finite primes where D is ramified. We assume that Σ does not contain any primes dividing p. We put $\Sigma_p = \Sigma \cup \{\mathfrak{p}\}_{\mathfrak{p}|p}$, and fix a maximal order $\mathcal{O}_D$ of D. Let $U = \prod_v U_v \subset (D \otimes_F \mathbb{A}_F^f)^\times$ be a compact open subgroup contained in $\prod_v (\mathcal{O}_D)_v^\times$, and we assume that $U_v = (\mathcal{O}_D)_v^\times$ for all $v \in \Sigma_p$. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the ring of integers of a p-adic field. We fix a continuous character $\psi : (\mathbb{A}_F^f)^\times / F^\times \to \mathcal{O}^\times$ such that ψ is trivial on $U_v \cap \mathcal{O}_{F_v}^\times$ for any finite place v of F. Let S be a finite set of primes containing the infinite primes, Σ_p, and the finite primes v of F such that $U_v \subset D_v^\times$ is not maximal compact. We fix a decomposition group $G_{F_v} \subset G_{F,S}$ for each $v \in S$. Let $\mathbb{T}'_{\psi,\mathcal{O}}(U)$ (resp. $\mathbb{T}_{\psi,\mathcal{O}}(U)$) denote the image of $\mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{univ}}_{S,\mathcal{O}}$ (resp. $\mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{univ}}_{S^p,\mathcal{O}}$) in the endomorphism ring of $S_{2,\psi}(U,\mathcal{O})$. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal of $\mathbb{T}_{\psi,\mathcal{O}}(U)$ that induces a non-Eisenstein maximal ideal of $\mathbb{T}^{\mathrm{univ}}_{S^p,\mathcal{O}}$, and put $\mathfrak{m}' = \mathfrak{m} \cap \mathbb{T}'_{\psi,\mathcal{O}}(U)$. Then there exists a continuous representation $\rho_{\mathfrak{m}'} : G_{F,S} \to GL_2(\mathbb{T}'_{\psi,\mathcal{O}}(U)_{\mathfrak{m}'})$ such that the characteristic polynomial of $\rho_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\mathrm{Frob}_v)$ is $X^2 - T_v X + \mathbf{N}(v) S_v$ for $v \notin S$. Here $\mathbf{N}(v)$ denotes the order of the residue field at v. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be the residue field of $\mathbb{T}'_{\psi,\mathcal{O}}(U)_{\mathfrak{m}'}$. Let $\bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'} : G_{F,S} \to GL_2(\mathbb{F})$ denote the representation obtained by reducing $\rho_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ modulo $\mathfrak{m}'$.

Now we suppose that $\bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ satisfies the following conditions.

1. $\bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ is unramified outside the primes of F dividing p.
2. The restriction of $\bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ to $G_{F(\zeta_p)}$ is absolutely irreducible.
3. If $p = 5$, and $\bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ has projective image isomorphic to $PGL_2(\mathbb{F}_5)$, then the kernel of $\operatorname{proj} \bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ does not fix $F(\zeta_5)$.
4. For each finite prime $v \in S \setminus \Sigma_p$, we have

$$\bigl(1 - \mathbf{N}(v)\bigr)\Bigl(\bigl(1 + \mathbf{N}(v)\bigr)^2 \det \bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\mathrm{Frob}_v) - \bigl(\mathbf{N}(v)\bigr)\bigl(\operatorname{tr} \bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\mathrm{Frob}_v)\bigr)^2\Bigr) \in \mathbb{F}^\times.$$

Let $R_{F,S}$ (resp. $R^{\square}_{F,S}$) be the universal deformation $\mathcal{O}$-algebra (resp. the universal framed deformation $\mathcal{O}$-algebra) of $\bar{\rho}_{\mathfrak{m}'}$, and put $\mathbb{T}^{\square} = R^{\square}_{F,S} \otimes_{R_{F,S}} \mathbb{T}_{\psi,\mathcal{O}}(U)_{\mathfrak{m}}$. We take a subset σ' of the set of primes of F dividing p, and an unramified character $\chi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $G_{F_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ for each $\mathfrak{p} \in \sigma'$, such that $\mathfrak{m}$ is σ-ordinary when we put $\sigma = (\sigma', \{\chi_{\mathfrak{p}}\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \sigma'})$. Now we can define a deformation ring $\tilde{R}^{\sigma,\psi}_{F,S}$ and a map $\tilde{R}^{\sigma,\psi}_{F,S} \to \mathbb{T}^{\square}$ as in (3.4) of [Kis].

Theorem 3.1. *With the above notation and the assumptions, $\tilde{R}^{\sigma,\psi}_{F,S} \to \mathbb{T}^{\square}$ is an isomorphism up to p-power torsion kernel.*

Proof. Applying the Theorem 2.4, the proof goes on as in the proof of [Kis, Theorem 3.4.11]. □

References

[Gee] T. Gee, *A modularity lifting theorem for weight two Hilbert modular forms*, Math. Res. Lett. **13** (2006), no. 5, 805–811.

[Kis] M. Kisin, *Moduli of finite flat group schemes, and modularity*, to appear in Ann. of Math.

[Ray] M. Raynaud, *Schémas en groupes de type* $(p,\dots,p)$, Bull. Soc. Math. France **102** (1974), 241–280.

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan.
E-mail address: `naoki@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp`